UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/587,318	06/05/2000	Kiril A. Pandelisev	PHOENIX	8159

7590 06/16/2003

James C Wray
1493 Chain Bridge Road
Suite 300
McLean, VA 22101

EXAMINER	
EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3762	14

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EC

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/587,318	Applicant(s) PANDELISEV, KIRIL A.	
	Examiner George R Evanisko	Art Unit 3762	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires *4* months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on *30 May 2003*. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

6/12/3

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☒ will not be entered (PAPER # 9 of 4/18/03) or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-41 and 84-105*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *42-83*.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

George R Evanisko
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3762

6/12/3

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments in the Response, paper 13, are not persuasive and do not place the application in condition for allowance. Claims 42-83 are withdrawn. The argument that claim 86 was cancelled is correct and paragraph 2(d) in the previous Advisory Action is withdrawn, although, new claim 106 in the amendment after final will raise new issues that will require further consideration and search. The argument 2b in the Response is not persuasive. Although the words "wound healing" ("wound treating" or "individual") may be found through out the specification and claims, those words were not in the claim body (or preamble) of claims 1, 85, 87, and 102 until they were presented in the After Final amendment. Therefore, they raise new issues in those claims that will require further consideration and search. In addition, the proposed After Final amendment, paper 9, and the proposed claims will NOT be entered for purposes of Appeal since the claims present new limitations and/or raise new issues.

The argument that the references do not teach the invention and would not have rendered it obvious are not persuasive. The references meet the "intended use limitations" presented in the claims and are "capable of meeting the functional use recitations" presented in the claims. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

In addition, the recitation "a healing apparatus" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).